## ORIGINAL

MARK J. BENNETT

2672

Attorney General of Hawaii

CINDY S. INOUYE

3968

JOHN M. CREGOR, JR.

3521

Deputy Attorneys General Department of the Attorney

General, State of Hawaii

425 Queen Street

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Telephone: (808) 586-1494 Facsimile: (808) 586-1369

Email: John.M.Cregor@hawaii.gov

Attorney for Defendants

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT SOURT DISTRICT OF HAVAIL

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

ANTHONY NESBIT,

Plaintiff,

VS.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, STATE OF HAWAI'I, et. al.

Defendants.

WILLIAM KOTIS,

Plaintiff,

VS.

STATE OF HAWAII DEPT. OF PUBLIC SAFETY, et. al.

Defendants.

CIVIL NO. 03-00455 SOM-KSC (Consolidated)

**DEFENDANTS MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'** MOTION FOR DISCOVERY SANCTIONS, AS ORDERED BY ORDER OF FEBRUARY 8, 2006; APPENDIX; CERTIFICATE OF **SERVICE** 

CIVIL NO. 04-00167 SOM-KSC (Consolidated)

Filed 03/10/2006

### **DEFENDANTS MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'** MOTION FOR DISCOVERY SANCTIONS, AS ORDERED **BY ORDER OF FEBRUARY 8, 2006**

On February 7, 2006, Plaintiffs filed their Motion for Discovery Sanctions related to outstanding Request for Production of Documents, as modified and limited by this Court's Order of December 7, 2005. Defendants acknowledge that their responses to these discovery requests have been slow, due in large part to the administrative burden upon the personnel at the Halawa Correctional Facility, tasked with obtaining the documents and facilitating the responses.

Defendants have now responded to Plaintiffs' Request for Production of Documents, to the best of their ability, although, it can be seen that the number of responsive documents is small, as explained by the Declaration of Linda Rivera. Plaintiffs had also requested that their Interrogatories, as limited and modified by this Court's December 7, 2005 Order, by answered separately by each named individual Defendant. Some of the named defendants are no longer in the employ of the State of Hawaii, Department of Public Safety and some had little if any connection to the issues raised in this case. As of the filing of this response, Answers prepared by Linda Lortz and Cinda Sandin, have been transmitted to the Plaintiffs and as more answers are finalized by the remaining defendants, they too will be transmitted to Plaintiffs.

Plaintiffs' request for the imposition of sanctions is based primarily upon their perception of prejudice as they claim to need the information to file their response to pending motions by the February 16, deadline. It appears that shortly after Plaintiffs prepared their motion, and unknown to them, Judge Mollway did, on February 9, 2006 reschedule the hearing on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment to April 6, 2006, obviating at least in part, prejudice to the Plaintiffs.

Defendants do apologize to the court for the length of time that it has taken to respond to Plaintiff's Discovery and therefore have no objections to a further postponement of the hearing on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment in order to give Plaintiffs adequate time to formulate their responses.

Further, as ordered by this Court, copies of the two Declarations of Monica Lortz are attached as an appendix.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, March 10, 2006.

Deputy Attorney General

Attorney for Defendants